



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and of other metrical devices characteristic of Spenser) ; and, finally, a chapter discussing traits in common of a more general nature. Dr. Read's thesis is that the influence of Spenser was not limited to Keats' early period, but that this influence 'increased with the growth of Keats' poetic powers,' especially 'as far as diction is concerned.' Although the thesis is doubtless well founded on the whole, it requires a somewhat more discriminating statement than it receives in this study, while the contention in regard to diction, especially, is probably overstated. Many of the peculiarities of diction, however, noted by the author in addition to those listed by Mr. W. T. Arnold, are significant and important. Others listed as 'Probably Borrowed' are mostly 'fanciful' or highly uncertain. Some of the strongest evidence cited (as, for example, on pages 28, 29), in the way of similarity of imagery and idea, is not brought into sufficient prominence. Although much is added in this study, the subject is not yet exhausted.

FREDERIC IVES CARPENTER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Die Altsächsische Bibeldichtung (Heliand und Genesis).
Erster Theil: Text herausgegeben von Paul Piper. J. G.
Cotta'sche Buchhandlung: Stuttgart 1897. Pp. cvi, 486.
(Denkmäler der Aelteren Deutschen Litteratur, Erster
Band.)

OF the Heliand editions that were heretofore available none could be said to be satisfactory in every respect. Behaghel's careful print, while answering admirably the purposes of such a publication, was yet a text-edition chiefly and could be used to good advantage only under certain favorable conditions. The scholarly edition of Sievers, the one from which probably most of us have learned the best we know about Heliand and Old Saxon, had in the course of nearly twenty years come to be in need of revision, owing to the subsequent discovery of new Ms. material and to the revival of Heliand-studies, chief among which was the master's own work on the rhythm of the alliterative verse. And Heyne's edition never was up to date; his faulty Old Saxon, like the Old English of his *Beowulf*, makes his text rather unfit for the use of the students to whose needs his editions are otherwise well adapted. A new edition of Heliand was therefore

in order, and it was equally commendable to combine with it the newly found fragments of the *Genesis* together with the corresponding OE. passages.

Piper, who is one of the most industrious bookmakers among European Germanists, has prepared his work upon the broadest basis, and Behaghel in reviewing the book has called it, not without reason, a 'Handbuch der Heliandforschung.' (*Litteraturblatt*, XVIII, p. 404.) The introduction, covering 106 pages, partly in small print, consists of three chapters: (1) Die Handschriften, (2) Die Heliandforschung, (3) Chronologische Uebersicht der Litteratur. Of these, the first and the third are thoroughly well done. The Mss. are minutely described after a renewed examination of C., M., P., and V., and the bibliography is next to complete; I have noticed only four titles of minor contributions that might have been added to the 316 compiled by the editor, besides, of course, the recent publications which Piper could not yet quote, such as Behaghel's monumental work, *Die Syntax des Heliand*. The second chapter presents a brief historical account of the progress of Heliand-studies under the following headings: (1) Historisches (dealing with Mss. and editions), (2) Die Praefatio und Versus, (3) Handschriften und Heimat, (4) Zeit der Abfassung, (5) Der Verfasser, (6) Die Quellen, (7) Die Genesis, (8) Grammatik, Lexicographie und Kritik des Gedichtes, (9) Metrisches, (10) Würdigung des Gedichtes. The peculiar order in which these paragraphs follow one another, — the problems of date and authorship being dealt with before the more fundamental questions of language and metre are at all touched upon, — illustrates at least one of the main shortcomings of the whole book, a remarkable lack of some of the higher pedagogical qualities. Here, to be sure, this defect is of little consequence, for the author does not really enter into a serious discussion of the various topics; he merely quotes briefly the *results* of his predecessors, usually without a word of criticism, and even where the editor's own views are given, they are stated dogmatically, without proof or argument. Thus we read on p. liii: 'Immer mehr bricht sich die Ansicht Bahn, dass C. mehr von dem Dialekte des originals bewahrt hat, wie auch metrische erwägungen zu dem gleichen ergebnisse führen'; on p. lv: 'Jedenfalls ist die Genesis nach dem Heliand entstanden, obwohl auch darin sich Meinungsverschiedenheit gezeigt hat'; on p. lvi: 'Dass der Verfasser von Heliand und Genesis identisch ist, ist anzunehmen.' In short, this whole chapter is of considerable

historical interest; but it adds nothing to our knowledge of the subject matter.

Piper's text is in the main based upon C., against Sievers and Behaghel,¹ and while this is in itself precarious enough, the case becomes much worse on account of the 'regulating' which the editor has bestowed upon the language of the poem. For a reliable reproduction of the original we are not yet ready, and we probably never shall be, unless another find should bring to light some new material. Piper's attempt is a failure; his text is practically as inconsistent as the manuscripts themselves are, and his deviations from the latter make it simply more difficult for the student to get at the genuine Ms. forms. He prints, f.i., *sīth*, *sīd*, *sīthea*, and *sīðo-gean*; *giskêth* and *giskêd*; *uuarth*, *uuarð*, *uuard*, *uurðun*,² *uurthi gilihthan*; *quad*, *quat*, *quâthun*, *stuodun*; *habda*, *ôbarhððdean*; *hiet*, *hêtun*; *githolonna*, *gifaranne*; for Germanic *an* before a fricative he prints *ð*, *ð*, and *uo*; etc. To be sure, the readings of the Mss. are very carefully given below the text; but that is only an awkward remedy against the editor's arbitrariness. The text is accompanied by explanatory notes which, considering the difference in typography, occupy much more space than the poem itself and in which the editor takes occasion to impart a great deal of information, genuine and spurious, helpful and superfluous, as the case may be. Useful is the quotation of the sources, in whatever way they may have been utilized by the author; welcome are further the references to all the previous literature on individual passages, and also many of the editor's own remarks and interpretations are quite helpful; but on the whole, the latter are utterly disappointing. Just for what class of readers they are intended is impossible to tell; they show no discriminative method, no sense of proportion; to the serious student of Germanics they are an insult, and yet they must remain largely incomprehensible to the general reader; self-evident passages are explained, the same trivial remarks are repeated over and over again, while interesting questions are often disposed of by brief reference to a small monograph, or to an article in some periodical which cannot be supposed to be readily accessible to every one.

¹ Behaghel shows in his review of Piper's book, that the Prague fragment does not support the editor's views; in the corresponding passage we find the better reading in C. 12 times, in M. 18 times.

² And yet the editor means to indicate two different sounds by *d* and by *ð*; p. 445 he says in a note on *ððan*, that in Heliand the form is always *ðdan* 'mit nicht aspiriertem d.'

Hundreds of notes should have been left out in which the OS. text is simply translated into German, and often its meaning quite distorted by a mechanical modernizing or else by purely visionary distinctions.

On the subject of metrics we might have expected to find a few lines setting forth the facts, at least, if not the principles of Old Germanic versification, and a concise statement of the points in which *Heliand* differs from the more archaic OE. and ON. poetry; instead, we are incidentally, in the notes, treated to such remarks as these: v. 180, *Thuo quam fruod gumo*; 'Zu beachten die auffallender Weise aufsteigende Betonung des Auftaktes.' V. 2027, *ne sind mina noh*; 'In der zweiten vershälfte ist hier ein mal der seltene Fall eines Auftaktes mit aufsteigendem Rhythmus.' V. 1046, *an êrdagun*; 'Ueber die Silbenverschleifung der zweiten Hebung s. P. VII, 48.' V. 2058, *that uuirsista*; 'Der zweite Halbvers bictet das geringstmögliche Mass, bei welchem der dreisilbigen Cadenz nur eine Silbe vorangeht.'

Of grammatical mistakes I have hardly noticed any which cannot be readily recognized as misprints, such as *uuekian*, *blikan* (twice), *eld* (cf. Holthausen in *ZfdA*, XLI, p. 303). Towards the end, however, these misprints accumulate quite suspiciously; in the OE. *Genesis* we find, in text and notes, a reckless indifference to accuracy of form. There, forms like *adælan*, *rædan*, *þara*, *svåleiks*, *zieman*, *leólc*, *eáfrun*, *fira*, *bezen* (repeatedly so), occur quite promiscuously with other forms exhibiting correct vowel quantities; we also meet with such infinitives as *æcwiðan*, *beþekkan*, *feollan*, *ʒengan*, *eðwan* (= *ywan*, *eáwan*); *hêhðe*, the editor says, stands for *heáhðu*, and for *ofermëttu* he prints *ofermettu* and explains this as acc. pl. neutr. of 'ofermet = Uebermass.'

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

UNIVERSITY OF INDIANA.

Deutsches Wörterbuch, von Hermann Paul. Max Niemeyer:
Halle a. S. 1897. Pp. vi, 576.

A TRUE appreciation of the work under discussion may be gained by comparing it with the author's *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*¹ in which the principles of language life are evolved and incidentally semasiology raised to the dignity of a science. While the chapter on shifting of meaning (*Bedeutungswandel*) bears most directly on the *Wb.*, there is little in the whole volume that would not aid us in forming a clear conception of the work in hand.

¹ Second edition. Halle, 1886.